



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

prize law conform to her common law at the expense of the harmony of international law. Mr. Roscoe recognizes this, to some extent at least, and offers the following truly British solution: "An assimilation of the prize law of other European countries to that of Great Britain can in the future only be obtained by the international recognition, as expressions of the law of nations, of particular reasoned British precedents. . . ." And this solution, as he justly says, "can scarcely be regarded as probable."

The chapters on "The Stowell Case Law and the Declaration of London," and on "The Stowell Case in the Great War," are valuable. The author regards the Declaration of London with much hostility, though conceding that it may be of some value to countries which have not the English case law of prize. And the existence of the English case law causes the author also to declare: "It is clear that an international Court of Appeal for prize cases is outside the range of possibility" (p. 92). The appendices are well arranged and of value.

The occasional rather naïve outcroppings of patriotism do not affect the value of the volume or destroy its charm. It is a book which should interest all lawyers and many laymen at this time.

RAEBURN GREEN.

CASES IN QUASI CONTRACT, SELECTED FROM DECISIONS OF ENGLISH AND AMERICAN COURTS. By Edward S. Thurston. St. Paul: West Publishing Company. 1916. pp. xv, 622.

This is an excellent case book. In fact the best on the subject now existing. Its six chapters, covering the conventional topics hitherto dealt with in text-books and case books, are: Nature of Quasi Contract, 50 pages; Benefits Conferred by Mistake, 182 pages; Benefits Conferred under Contract which has been Partially Preferred, 195 pages; Benefits Voluntarily Conferred without Contract, 56 pages; Benefits Conferred under Compulsion, 89 pages; Waiver of Tort, 41 pages. The arrangement of the subdivisions and the selection of cases seem to be admirable. There is of course no better proof of this than the use of the book in the class room, and the volume has well stood a six weeks' test with students. The only possible improvement of classification that might be suggested in the earlier portion of the book would be to place ch. II, 1, I, c, Mistake as to Collateral Matters, after ch. II, 2, IV, Mistake as to the Nature of Subject-Matter of a Contract. But this is arguable.

Many of the cases are new; more than two-thirds of them had not appeared in Scott's Cases. A partial test reveals that they have been excellently abbreviated, with the exception that an interesting point is omitted in *Haven v. Foster* 9 Pick. 112 (p. 228). The citation of cases in the notes is careful; and there seems to be no instance of the fault, exasperating to the teacher, of printing cases not in point. In case book making it is no doubt ordinarily wise to select for the notes, while indicating the weight of authority, only important decisions. This Professor Thurston has done well. But in a subject like Quasi Contract, which is still incompletely understood by the courts, and in which it is difficult to run down cases in digest, it would seem helpful to have a more exhaustive list of authorities in the notes than here appears; though this omission is partially remedied by the number of new principal cases. In any event the important recent decision on change of position of *Baylis v. Bishop of London*, [1913] 1 Ch. 127, should have appeared, or at least been referred to.

We can commend highly the quality of the paper. The book, containing over 600 pages, is less than 1¼ inches thick including the cover; and yet the paper takes readily and retains well pencil or ink annotations.

JOSEPH WARREN.